

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TIMOTHY PEOPLES,
Plaintiff,

v.

RAUL MACHUCA, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [19-cv-05468-YGR](#) (PR)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
REQUESTS FOR LEAVE TO FILE
A SUR-REPLY**


Before the Court are Plaintiff's requests for leave to file a sur-reply and for an extension of time "to file [his] objection to Defendants['] reply" in support of the pending motion for summary judgment. Dkts. 72, 75. Defendants object to Plaintiff's request for leave to file a sur-reply. Dkt. 74.

First, the Court notes that Plaintiff filed his request for leave to file a sur-reply prior to Defendants filing their reply. *See* Dkts. 72, 73. In any event, Defendants have since filed their reply. Dkt. 73. After Defendants filed their reply, Plaintiff filed his request for an extension of time to file his sur-reply. Dkt. 75. Because the Local Rules do not permit the filing of a response to a reply, *see* Civ. L.R. 7-3(d), the Court liberally construes Plaintiff's pending motions as requests for leave to file a sur-reply. However, Plaintiff has not shown, nor is there any indication in the record, that a sur-reply is either necessary or appropriate. Accordingly, Plaintiff's requests are DENIED. Dkt. 72, 75.

This Order terminates Docket No. 72 and 75.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 10, 2021


JUDGE YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
United States District Judge